



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,600	04/14/2004	Gregory G. Jones	5486-0172PUS1	6239
67321	7590	08/23/2007	EXAMINER	
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP			KARIMI, PEGEMAN	
8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 100 EAST			2629	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/823,600	JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pegeman Karimi	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-17,19-23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-17,19-23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 6/12/2007 has been entered and considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 17, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061), in view of Salmon (Pub. No. 2003/0048256), and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent 6,056,458).

As to claim 1, Batra (Fig. 6) discloses a computer keyboard system comprising:
a base (14) having a number pad (204) and
a removable section (12) having an alphanumeric key cluster (147) and a wireless transmitter (Fig. 4B, 370); the removable section (12) being removably coupleable to the base (14), (col. 1, lines 62-63) wherein the removable section (12) transmits a signal (Fig. 4B, 52) to a host computer (100) via the base. Batra does not teach a biometric reader. Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a biometric reader (13) for reading a biometric characteristic of a user (paragraph 68). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of

Salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a removable section includes a scrolling device. Lin teaches a keyboard (1) wherein the removable section (11, Fig. 2) includes a scrolling device (24). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the scrolling device of Lin to the computer keyboard system of Batra as modified by Salmon because by operating the scrolling device on the keyboard and incorporating with the program of the control unit, it can perform the operations of page up, page down in addition to a traditional keyboard operations (col. 2, lines 1-6)

As to claim 16, Batra (Fig. 4B) discloses a computer keyboard (12) configured for wireless communication (106) with a computer (100), comprising: a keyboard housing (14); a keyboard processor (col. 2, line 2) configured to cooperate with a transmitter (350) for wireless communication (106) to a computer (col. 2, line 8-10); and a removable alphanumeric section (12) having a processor (col. 2, line 2) and a transmitter (370) for wireless communication (106) to the computer; the alphanumeric section (12) including a group of alphanumeric keys (Fig. 6, 147) being operatively connected to the processor (col. 5, line 53-60).

Batra does not teach a fingerprint reader. Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a fingerprint reader (13) mounted to the keyboard housing (2) (paragraph 63). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a removable section includes a scrolling device. Lin teaches a keyboard (1) wherein the removable section (11, Fig. 2) includes a scrolling device (24).

As to claim 6, Salmon teaches (Fig. 1) a biometric reader (13) comprising a fingerprint reader configured to send a decoupling signal so as to decouple the removable (extend the keyboard) from the base (enclosure, 2) responsive to a fingerprint identification of a user (paragraph 68)

As to claim 20, Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a fingerprint reader (13) is configured to send a decoupling signal to the keyboard (3) processor (20) responsive to a fingerprint identification of a user (paragraph 68).

As to claims 2 and 17, Batra teaches a computer keyboard (10) system wherein the removable section (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

As to claim 4, Batra teaches a computer keyboard system, wherein the base (14) includes a wireless receiver (Fig. 4B, 375), the wireless receiver being configured

to receive wireless signals (375) from the wireless transmitter (370) of the removable section (12) (Fig. 6 refers to 4A and 4B. col. 6, lines 59-60).

As to claim 19, this claim differs from claim 4 only in that the limitation "housing" is additionally recited. Batra clearly teaches a housing (14) includes a wireless receiver (Fig. 4B, 375).

As to claim 7, Batra (Fig. 6) teaches a computer keyboard system, in which the base (14) includes a receiving portion (130) adapted to substantially enclose the removable section (12) therein (col.6, lines 61-63).

As to claim 21, this claim differs from claim 7 in that the limitation "keyboard housing" is additionally recited. Batra teaches a keyboard housing (14) and a removable alphanumeric section (12).

As to claim 8, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches a computer keyboard (10) system, wherein the removable section (12) removable coupling comprises a media interface (Media interface detail of removable keyboard 12 is shown better in Fig. 6, element 98).

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon and further in view of Lin, as applied to claims 1 and 4, and further in view Cheng (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0174123).

As to claim 5, note the discussion of Batra, Salmon, and Lin above. Batra, Salmon, and Lin do not teach a wireless mouse. Cheng (Fig. 4) teaches a computer keyboard (2)

system including a wireless mouse (1) configured to wirelessly communicate (paragraph 14) with the wireless receiver (23) of the base (2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the wireless mouse of Cheng to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon and Lin because wire and wireless mouse can be substituted each other; the wireless mouse would provide the benefit of carrying from one place to another place easily.

5. Claims 9, 10, 12-15, 22, and 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon, and further in view of Lin ('145) and in view of Lin (U.S. Patent 6,056,458).

As to claim 9, Batra discloses a computer keyboard system comprising: a first keyboard housing (14); a number pad (204) with a key cluster (i.e. 210, 206, 208) and a second keyboard housing (12) having an alphanumeric section (147); wherein said second keyboard housing is nestable (col. 6, lines 61-62) within a receiving portion (130) of the first keyboard housing and removably coupleable (col. 7, line 28-30) to the first keyboard housing (14) such that when said first keyboard housing and second keyboard housing are coupled together (col. 6, lines 61-62),

Batra teaches the first keyboard housing (14) includes a processor (col. 2, line 2) operable to electrically charge to a mobile power source in the second keyboard housing (battery, col. 4, line 44-45).

Batra does not teach a biometric reader. Salmon (Fig. 1) teaches a biometric reader (13) for reading a biometric characteristic of a user. Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a processor included in the keyboard housing. Lin ('145), (Fig. 2) teaches a first keyboard housing (1) including a processor therein (col. 1, line 12-13) Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the built in processor of Lin to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon because the arrangement of the processor in the keyboard of Lin would benefit of replacing all different kinds of connectors easily (see col. 2, lines 28-30 of Lin).

Batra, Salmon, and Lin ('145) do not teach a removable section includes a scrolling device. Lin ('458) teaches a keyboard (1) wherein the second keyboard housing (11, Fig. 2) includes a scrolling device (24). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the scrolling device of Lin to the computer keyboard system of Batra as modified by Salmon and Lin because by operating the scrolling device on the keyboard and incorporating with the program of the control unit, it can perform the operations of page up, page down in addition to a traditional keyboard operations (col. 2, lines 1-6)

As to claim 22, Batra teaches a computer keyboard configured for communication with a computer (106), comprising:

a keyboard housing (10);

a removable keyboard portion (12) comprising:

an alphanumeric section (40) including a group of alphanumeric keys (40) being operatively connectable to the keyboard processor (51);

a transmitter (370) for wireless communication (Fig. 4B). Batra does not teach a biometric reader.

Salmon teaches a biometric reader (7) device configured for communicating with the keyboard processor (paragraph 89). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the biometric reader of Salmon to the keyboard of Batra because the biometric reader of salmon would prevent other users to operate the device without permission (i.e. authority) thereby eliminating the security problem caused by other users (see paragraph 68 of Salmon).

Batra and Salmon do not teach a processor within the keyboard. Lin teaches a keyboard processor (col. 1, line 12-11) with in the keyboard housing (Fig. 1, 1) for communicating with the computer (col. 1, line 15-16) Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the built in processor of Lin to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon

because the arrangement of the processor in the keyboard of Lin would benefit of replacing all different kinds of connectors easily (see col. 2, lines 28-30 of Lin).

Batra, Salmon, and Lin ('145) do not teach a computer keyboard comprising a scrolling device. Lin ('458) teaches a keyboard (1) comprising a scrolling device (24). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the scrolling device of Lin to the computer keyboard system of Batra as modified by Salmon and Lin for the same reason as previously discussed with respect to claim 9.

As to claim 10, Batra teaches a computer keyboard (10) system wherein the second keyboard housing (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

As to claim 12, Batra (Fig. 4B) teaches a computer keyboard (12) wherein the first keyboard housing (14) includes a wireless receiver (345) and the second keyboard housing (12) includes a wireless transmitter (370), the wireless receiver (345) being configured to receive wireless signals (52) from the wireless transmitter (370) of the second keyboard housing (12).

As to claim 13, Batra teaches decoupling the second keyboard (12) housing from the first keyboard (14), (col. 3, lines 52-53). Batra does not teach a biometric device. Salmon teaches (Fig. 1) a biometric device (13) comprises a fingerprint reader system configured to send a signal based on fingerprint identification of a user ([0068], lines 16-23).

As to claim 14, Batra teaches a computer keyboard system, wherein the second keyboard housing (12) is configurable in an abutment relationship (col. 6, lines 61-62) with the first keyboard housing (14).

As to claim 15, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches, a computer keyboard (10) system, wherein the second keyboard housing (12) removable coupling comprises media interface (Fig. 6, 98) configured to cooperate with the processor (col. 4, lines 59-61).

As to claim 23, Batra (Fig. 2) teaches a computer keyboard (10), wherein the removable keyboard portion (12) includes a cursor control device (44).

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon, Lin ('145), and Lin ('458) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Cheng (Pub. No. 2003/0174123).

As to claim 25, note the discussion in claim 22, Batra, Salmon, Lin ('145) and Lin ('458) do not teach a wireless mouse. Cheng (Fig. 4) teaches a keyboard (2) including a wireless mouse (1) configured for wireless communication (Paragraph 114) with the computer (3) via the keyboard processor (23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added the wireless mouse of Cheng to the keyboard of Batra as modified by Salmon, Lin ('145), and Lin ('458) because wire and wireless mouse can be substituted each other; the wireless mouse would provide the benefit of carrying from one place to another place easily.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, filed on 6/12/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2, 4-10, 12-17, 19-23, and 25 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive.

In view of amendment and argument of "common assignee" to the reference of Mcloone, the reference of Lin ('458) has been added for new ground of rejections.

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pegeman Karimi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pegeman Karimi
08/07/2007


CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER